

DRAFT**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: James D. Redmond, et al.
Serial No.: 09/090,067
Filed: June 3, 1998

Group Art Unit: 3722
Examiner: M. Henderson

For: IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT WITH DOCUMENT SPECIFIC REDUCED SCALE PRINTING

June 21, 2000
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington DC 20231

AMENDMENT UNDER C.F.R. 116 (AFTER FINAL PRACTICE) FILED
CONCURRENTLY WITH NOTICE OF APPEAL

Dear Sir:

This is a timely response to the Final Office Action received upon the filing by Applicants of an Amendment (filed Dec 20, 2000) in response to a First Office Action (dated June 20, 2000). The Final Office Action (Paper No. 18) is dated March 27, 2001 with a three month shortened statutory period for response. All rejections in the Final Action are directed to *35 U.S.C. § 103* obviousness rejections over a combination of two references, Craven et. al in view of Merry et al. While Applicants appreciate Examiner's contentions, Applicants do not believe the rejections are entirely correct as they are based on incorrect interpretation of Craven and improper combination with Merry. Arguments are set forth below to traverse the rejections in an effort to quickly move the application towards allowance, or place the issues in better form for Appeal. Claims 1,11,21 have been amended, without prejudice, and do not necessitate a search or raise new issues. To this end, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the arguments and an imminent grant of a Telephone Interview, to place the application in condition for allowance or place the issues in better form for Appeal.

Ser. No. 09/090,067
June 21, 2001
Page 2 of 12

DRAFT

The Amendment submitted herewith is compliant with Changes to the Patent Rules, 37 C.F.R. 1.121 effective Mar 1, 2001, and meets the new Amendment practice requiring "clean" claims and "marked-up" claim submissions. Accordingly, the following is attached.

- (1) A clean version of each replacement claim on a separate page with clear instructions for entry
- (2) Remarks and Arguments (37 C.F.R. 111) on a separate page
- (3) Marked-up version of claims on a separate page entitled "Version with markings to show changes made".

Applicant wishes to bring to the attention of the Examiner a change in the attorney docket on this case. The case when filed had the attorney docket NI9007. Since, it had been assigned to Polaroid Corporation, and the attorney docket should now be corrected to C8371/LS. Applicant requests a correction to this effect.